transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

## PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Good morning. This is the time and place set for sentencing in criminal number 20-00169. I'd ask counsel for the government to enter your appearance, please.

MR. LUSTY: May it please the Court, Jonathan Lusty on behalf of the government.

THE COURT: On behalf of defendant, please?

MR. DEMATT: Michael DeMatt on behalf of

Mr. Augustyniak-Duncan.

THE COURT: Sir, would you kindly stand to be sworn,

please.

(ANDREW AUGUSTYNIAK-DUNCAN was duly sworn)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: You may be seated.

THE COURT: And whenever you speak, you all can take your mask if you're comfortable in doing that.

The court notes for the record that on June 2, 2021, defendant entered a plea of guilty to count one of a one-count indictment, charging the defendant with obstruction of law enforcement during civil disorder in violation of Title 18

United States Code Section 231(a)(3) and Section 2.

Following the guilty plea, the Court directed the probation office to prepare a pre-sentence investigation report and scheduled a sentencing hearing for October 13, 2021.

Because of objections raised by the parties with respect to the defendant's final pre-sentence investigation report, which this court determined required an evidentiary hearing and additional briefing, defendant's sentencing hearing was continued to today, December 14, 2021.

The court has received and reviewed the pre-sentence investigation report and addendum thereto prepared by the United States probation office. The Court has also reviewed the government's position with respect to sentencing factors and defendant's position with respect to sentencing factors.

By the way of summary only, the government asserts that defendant's conduct in this case constituted aggravated assault and thus, pursuant to Section 2A2.4(c)(1) of the United States sentencing guidelines, section 2A2.2 of the guidelines should be applied to determine defendant's offense level.

Accordingly, the government objected to Paragraph 20 of the final pre-sentence investigation report because it calculated defendant's base offense level under Section 2A2.4 and not under 2A2.2. The government then contends that defendant's offense level should be increased by four levels under Section 2A2.2(b)(2)(B) because a dangerous weapon was used by the defendant, and should be increased by three levels under 2A2.2(b)(3)(A) because the victims, police officers, working during a civil disorder on May 30, 2020, sustained

bodily injuries -- in other words -- concussions, as part of the result of defendant's actions.

To the contrary, defendant asserts that his conduct in this case does not constitute aggravated assault, and thus defendant's offense level should be calculated pursuant to 2A2.4.

Defendant then objects to Paragraph 21 of the pre-sentence investigation report wherein two levels were added to defendant's base level pursuant to Section 2A2.4(b) on the basis that as a result of defendant's conduct on May 30, 2020, at least one police officer sustained bodily injury.

Defendant also asserts that with respect to Paragraph 31 of the pre-sentence investigation report, wherein it states: "Defendant beat the victim to the point of unconsciousness with a metal baseball bat," that this statement should not be included in the pre-sentence investigation report because such statement is consistent with aggravated assault, which charges were withdrawn, and not a simple assault, for which the defendant was eventually convicted in a different situation.

On December 13, 2001, the court issued tentative findings and rulings, indicating that the defendant's conduct in this case constituted aggravated assault, and thus pursuant to 2A2.4(c)(1) of the guidelines, Section 2A2.2 would be applied to determine defendant's offense level.

The court also determined that based on its ruling that it would apply 2A2.2 in determining defendant's offense level and that defendant's base level shall not increased by two levels pursuant to Section 2A2.4(b), as set forth in Paragraph 21 of the pre-sentence investigation report, which renders defendant's objection to Paragraph 21 of the pre-sentence investigation report moot.

The court also determined defendant's offense level should be increased by four levels under Section 2A2.2(b)(2)(B) because a dangerous weapon was used by defendant, but that it should not be increased by three levels under Section 2A2.2(b)(3)(A) because the government did not sufficiently establish that any police officer working during the civil disorder on May 30, 2020 sustained bodily injury as a result of the defendant's action.

Finally, the court concluded as to Paragraph 31 of the pre-sentence investigation report that, one, the statement defendant objected to in that paragraph had no effect on either defendant's offense level or criminal history category calculation, and therefore no effect on the advisory guidelines sentencing range applicable to defendant in this case.

And, two, Title 18 United States Code Section 3661 provides that "no limitation shall be placed on the information concerning the background, character and conduct

of a person convicted of an offense which a court in the United States may receive and consider for the purposes of imposing an appropriate sentence." The court adopts the tentative findings and rulings as final.

The court also has reviewed the government's sentencing memorandum, wherein it requests a guidelines sentence.

The court has also reviewed the defendant's sentencing memorandum in which defendant requests a variance below the applicable advisory guideline sentencing range, with mental health and substance abuse evaluation and dual diagnoses treatment conditions, and letters of support attached to defendant's sentencing memorandum.

The court has also reviewed a statement from one of the police officers who was injured during the May 30, 2020 civil disorder.

Finally, the court has reviewed the sentencing recommendation prepared by the probation office.

Sir, on June 2, 2021, you entered a plea of guilty in this courtroom to count one of a one-count indictment at criminal number 20-00169, charging you with obstruction of law enforcement during a civil disorder in violation of Title 18 United States Code Section 231(a)(3) and Section 2. Correct, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Following your guilty plea, I directed the probation office to prepare a pre-sentence investigation report, which I've reviewed along with the addendum and the sentencing recommendation of the probation office.

Pursuant to the standing order -- pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 32(e)(3), the Court finds it's not appropriate to disclose the recommendation of the probation office to defendant, his counsel, nor to counsel for the government; however, sir, in determining your sentence, the court will not consider any matter that's not previously been disclosed to you or your attorney other than this recommendation.

Counsel, have you reviewed the pre-sentence investigation report, addendum thereto and discussed them with your client?

MR. DEMATT: Yes, I have, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Are there any errors in the pre-sentence investigation report or addendum that you have not previously called to the court's attention.

MR. DEMATT: Nothing additional, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Sir, have you reviewed the pre-sentence investigation report, addendum thereto, tentative findings of this court and other matters and discussed them with your attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.

THE COURT: Counsel, is there any legal cause why

sentence should not be pronounced?

MR. DEMATT: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything else you would like to say or the defendant would like to say, now would be the appropriate time, please.

MR. DEMATT: Thank you, Your Honor. First of all, I'm not sure Mr. Augustyniak-Duncan intends to address the court or not, but I do wish to focus on a couple of issues here.

THE COURT: Please.

MR. DEMATT: With respect to our request for a variance, Judge, as can be seen in the pre-sentence investigation report, Mr. Augustyniak-Duncan did have a very extensive -- does have a very extensive mental health history as well as a very extensive substance abuse history. And it certainly seems pretty clear, as you look at his criminal history and, you know, the issues that he's had, that that is really the root cause of all of the troubles that he has dealt with during his life.

And it appears that when he does get some treatment that he does well, he can be productive. In fact, not too long before the pandemic hit, he was working and, I believe, things were -- he was moving in the right direction.

Unfortunately, the pandemic did hit, and as a result of that, he lost his work because the restaurant shut down,

and that's where he had been working. He -- you know, it's kind of anecdotally, I think we're all familiar with the fact that with the isolation that was caused by the pandemic, a lot of mental health issues became exacerbated for a lot of individuals. And I'll submit to the court that's exactly what happened here, which ultimately led to the unfortunate incident that brings him before you.

While he -- while he's been incarcerated, as well, Your Honor, he's been subjected to much harsher conditions than some people incarcerated in non-COVID times. The freedom of movement is much more greatly restricted during COVID, subjected him to quarantines, subjected him to things like 23 hours in his cell per day. And in fact, one of the times we've had a hearing scheduled, it had to be rescheduled because of the fact that Mr. Augustyniak-Duncan actually had been diagnosed with COVID-19 while at the Allegheny County Jail.

So under these extra harsh conditions, you know, I would submit that a day in Allegheny County Jail over the past year and a half, two years, is a much harsher sentence than a day in Allegheny County Jail would have been prior to the COVID-19 pandemic. And that's something that should be taken into account with respect to what an appropriate sentence is in this case.

Bottom line here though, is that I believe that the

appropriate sentence in this case should take into account the mental health and substance abuse history, and address that root cause. Because if he's able to tackle that, conquer that, those issues, then he can be productive — he will be productive and he will not have further legal issues in the future. If he's not put in the right type of treatment, if he doesn't have a dual diagnoses evaluation and sort of treatment that would be appropriate along those lines, he's just destined to fail. So these are all things, I believe, should be taken into account in the interest of justice.

Then finally, Mr. Augustyniak-Duncan's mother is currently residing in Palm Coast, Florida, which, according to my research, looks like it's in the Middle District of Florida. And if he -- whenever he does get released, he does intend to relocate to that area since his mother is down there and she's basically his biggest support system. We would request that a recommendation be made by this court that he be placed as close to the Middle District of Florida as possible.

THE COURT: Is that like the Orlando area?

MR. DEMATT: Yeah, it's actually kind of -- it's like a gerrymandered district, to be honest with you. It's kind of between Jacksonville and Daytona.

THE COURT: Do you have any recommendation to any training he would like to receive while incarcerated?

MR. DEMATT: Carpentry, apparently, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And any request for the residential drug treatment program?

MR. DEMATT: Yes.

THE COURT: On behalf of the government, any objection to defendant being incarcerated as close as possible to the Middle District of Florida, that he receive mental health evaluation and treatment, if necessary? And third, that he receive training in carpentry or some other construction trade, and that he be evaluated and admitted to the 500-hour residential drug treatment program?

MR. LUSTY: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I'll so make those four recommendations.

Anything you would like to say, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. I just wanted to say that if I'd have been busy at the time and had been on a schedule and doing something other than sitting in my house, watching what was going on on the news and on my medication, that I would have made a better choice to stay at home. And I kick myself all the time for not just staying home. And I know I could make better choices in the future. I just need to stay on top of my mental health and my drug issues and that's really all I have.

THE COURT: Well, that's a very mature statement so I thank you for that. And your selection of carpentry is a wise one. My dad was a carpenter, it's a very satisfying trade.

So I compliment you on that choice also.

Are you satisfied with the service and representation provided by your attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: I am.

THE COURT: Has he done everything you've asked him to do?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Has he done anything you believe he should not have done?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: On behalf of the government?

MR. LUSTY: Yes, Your Honor. Just briefly, to supplement the sentencing memorandum. Your Honor had the opportunity to observe the video in this case of the incident, and you've had several of the other defendants so this court has a good understanding of what was going on that day.

And the defendant's actions, you can see from the video, there was a crowd of people and some of the individuals in the crowd, the defendant included, chose to take advantage of what they thought was their anonymity. And take a piece of concrete or two pieces of concrete and throw them towards uniformed police officers. 30 minutes later, there was another situation where there was a pipe the defendant took and he threw it towards uniformed police officers.

The fact that there were officers there, trying to

maintain order, or to reestablish order, what people like the defendant and other individuals did was just completely undermine the peaceful protest. And, you know, the defendant took advantage of the fact that there was a situation where there was a large crowd and he served to further escalate the situation. These were officers who were simply trying to do their jobs that day. And you know, whether or not we can show specifically that the defendant injured the officers when he threw the concrete, there's clearly circumstantial evidence that he did. And if not, clearly it shows that throwing pieces of concrete could have caused injuries, including concussions or other serious injuries.

Based on that, the government believes that, as other defendant's were sentenced within the guidelines, the guideline range sentence is appropriate in this case.

advisory only. The court has discretion to deviate or vary from the guidelines after considering the relevant sentencing factors set forth in Title 18 United States Code Section 3553(a). The court must also rule on any motions for departure or requests for variance.

Before the court considers any motion for departure or request for variance, as stated in my tentative findings of facts and conclusions of law, which I previously adopted as final, the court finds that the offense -- defendant's offense

level is 15, that he has a criminal history of VI, and that the sentencing guidelines range is 41 to 51 months imprisonment, supervised release of one to three years, a fine of \$7,500 to \$75,000, a special assessment of \$100. Further, defendant's guideline range falls within Zone D of the guidelines, so defendant is not eligible for probation.

Is my statement as to defendant's offense level, criminal history category and guidelines range correct?

MR. LUSTY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Agreed?

MR. DEMATT: Agreed, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Understand, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Defendant's request for downward variance -- requests a downward variance from the advisory guideline sentencing range, as I will explain in detail in a few moments. Taking into consideration the factors set forth in Title 18 United States Code Section 3553(a), as applied to this case, defendant's request for downward variance is denied because the court finds a sentence within the advisory guidelines is sufficient, but no greater than necessary, to satisfy the purposes of sentencing, including just punishment, deterrence, protection of the public, and rehabilitation of the defendant.

Anything else on behalf of the government before I

pronounce sentence?

MR. LUSTY: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: On behalf of the defendant?

MR. DEMATT: No Your Honor.

THE COURT: Sir, pursuant to the Sentencing Reform

Act of 1984, it is the judgment of this court that the

defendant be sentenced to 41 months imprisonment, which is at

the low end of the guidelines range. Defendant's term of

imprisonment is to be followed by three years of supervised

release.

Within 72 hours of release from the Bureau of Prisons, defendant shall report in person to the probation office in the district in which he's released to be placed on supervision. While on supervised release, defendant shall not commit another federal, state or local crime, shall comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by this court and shall comply with the following additional conditions:

One, defendant shall not illegally possess a controlled substance. Supervised release must be revoked for possession of a controlled substance.

Two, defendant shall not possess a firearm, ammunition, destructive device or other dangerous weapon. Supervised release must be revoked for possession of a firearm, ammunition, destructive device or other dangerous

weapon.

Three, defendant shall participate in a program of testing, and if necessary, treatment for substance abuse, said program to be approved by the probation officer until such time defendant is released from the program by the probation officer and/or the Court. Further, the defendant shall be required to contribute to the cost of services for any such treatment in an amount to be determined by the probation officer, but no to exceed actual costs. The defendant shall submit to one drug urinalysis within 15 days of being placed on supervision, and at least two periodic tests thereafter.

Four, defendant shall not purchase, possess and/or use any substance or device designed to alter in any way or substitute defendant's urine specimen for drug testing. In addition, defendant shall not purchase, possess and/or use any device or devices designed to be used for submission of a third party drug urine specimen.

Five, defendant shall submit his person, property, house, residence, vehicle, papers, business or place of employment to a search conducted by a United States probation officer at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner based upon a reasonable suspicion of contraband or evidence of a violation of a condition of supervision. Failure to submit to such a search may be grounds for revocation. Defendant shall inform any other residents that the premises may be subject to

searches pursuant it this condition.

Six, defendant shall participate in a mental health assessment and/or treatment program approved by the probation officer until such time defendant is released from the program by the probation officer and/or the court. Defendant shall be required to contribute to the cost of services in an amount to be determined by the probation officer, but not to exceed actual costs. The probation office is authorized to release defendant's pre-sentence investigation report to the treatment provider, if so requested.

Seven, defendant shall participate in the United States Probation Office's Work Force Development Program as directed by the probation officer.

Eight, defendant shall cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the probation officer. Court also imposes a mandatory special assessment of \$100, constituting a \$100 special assessment at each count to which the defendant has pled guilty, which shall be paid to the Clerk of Court forthwith. Based upon the financial information contained in the pre-sentence investigation report, court finds the defendant does not have the ability to pay a fine and therefore waives imposition of any fine.

Sir, the reason for your sentence is as follows: The court considers a sentence of 41 months imprisonment and three years supervised release to be sufficient, but no greater than

necessary to comply with the goals of sentencing as set forth in Title 18 United States Code Section 3553(a)(2), which are to reflect the seriousness of this offense, to promote respect for the law and provide for just punishment for this offense, to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct, to protect the public from further crimes by this defendant and to provide the defendant with needed educational, vocational training and medical care in the most effective manner.

The court has considered all the sentencing factors set forth in Title 18 United States Code Section 3553(a), including those presented by the government and defense, and as set forth in the pre-sentence investigation report and addendum thereto.

The court has also considered the following: First, the court has considered the nature and circumstances of the offense. Defendant pled guilty to obstruction of law enforcement during a civil disorder, for his engaging in serious criminal conduct that is further addressed in the pre-sentence investigation report. And the court incorporates, by reference, Paragraphs 7 through 13 of the pre-sentence investigation report, upon which the court bases this sentence.

By way of summary only: On May 30, 2020, defendant repeatedly threw objects at police officers who were working during a civil disorder in Downtown Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Most significantly, at one point in the civil disorder, defendant intentionally, knowingly and purposefully threw a large piece of concrete directly at a line of police officers while in close proximity to those officers with the intent to cause bodily injury to the officers with the concrete.

The court finds defendant's pattern of conduct that day to be outrageous. And indeed, the court finds defendant's conduct on that day to be so outrageous that even if the court had agreed to defendant's position that he did not -- his conduct did not constitute aggravated assault, such as the offense level was calculated under Section 2A2.4 and not Section 2A2.2, the court still would have imposed the sentence of 41 months imprisonment.

Second, the court has considered the defendant's criminal, family and social history and personal characteristics as further outline in the pre-sentence investigation report at Paragraphs 29 through 74, which the court incorporates as part of the basis for his sentence today.

By way of summary only: Defendant is approximately 26 years old, graduated from high school, has worked in the past at a number of restaurants, but is currently unemployed and obviously is incarcerated.

Defendant has a significant criminal history, which is why the criminal history category is VI. His adult

criminal history includes convictions for simple assault, drug possession twice, robbery, corruption of a minor, giving a 13-year-old drugs, driving under the influence of alcohol or controlled substance, in particular drugs, fleeing or attempting to elude an officer, driving while license was suspended or revoke and resisting arrest. He also committed the instant offense while he was on state court parole.

Defendant has significant history of mental health issues, as well as a history drug abuse. Accordingly, both mental health and drug abuse evaluation and treatment are part of the sentence, both based on the recommendations I've made to the Bureau of Prisons as well as during the three-year period of his supervised release thereafter.

Third, the court has also considered the kinds of sentences available for this offense and the sentencing guidelines under the advisory guidelines and applicable policy statements adopted by the sentencing commission.

And lastly, the court has considered the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities among defendants with similar records who have been found guilty of similar conduct. In particular, I believe, this sentence is consistent with the other sentences that I've imposed with other defendants that participated in this event, considering their particular conduct, their criminal history category and other factors set forth in Section 3553(a).

On behalf of the government, has my statement of reasons adequately addressed all objections, concerns and issues raised?

MR. LUSTY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: There are any other sentencing factors under Section 3553(a) that the court has failed to address?

MR. LUSTY: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Counsel, does my statement of reasons adequately address all objections, concerns and issues raised?

MR. DEMATT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Are there any other sentencing factors under Section 3553(a) that the court has failed to address?

MR. DEMATT: No.

THE COURT: Have you had an opportunity to discuss with the defendant his right to appeal?

MR. DEMATT: I have, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Sir, you have the right to appeal from the orders of his court, judgment of guilty and/or from the sentence imposed. You have the right to have a lawyer represent you on appeal at no cost to you. If you cannot afford them, certified copies of the necessary records and transcripts will be furnished at the expense of the United States government. If you appeal, the notice of appeal must be filed within 14 days of today, otherwise you will lose your right to appeal. If you request, the Clerk of Court will

1 immediately prepare and file a notice of appeal on your 2 behalf. 3 Do you wish to appeal, sir? THE DEFENDANT: 4 No. 5 THE COURT: Do you understand if you change your mind 6 and decide to appeal, any notice of appeal must be filed 7 within 14 days of today, otherwise you will lose your right to appeal? 8 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. THE COURT: And if you change your mind and decide to 10 11 appeal, you will lose your current counsel for any appeal. 12 Correct? 13 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 14 THE COURT: Anything else on behalf of the 15 government? 16 MR. LUSTY: No. Thank you, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Defendant? 18 MR. DEMATT: No, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Sir, you're a relatively young man, 20 certainly from my vantage point. I thought your statement 21 today was very mature. And I think you know the way forward, 22 if you so choose to follow it. 23 I've done everything I can as part of my recommendations for your incarceration and for the time that 24 25 you're on supervised release to get you the care and

evaluations that are necessary. So I just want to wish you well. And if you stay wise in what you've told me and get a trade, I think you can have a good life once this -- your incarceration is over. I think you've been incarcerated since that incident. Correct?

MR. DEMATT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So all that time will count as federal time, which will be calculated by the Bureau of Prisons. If there's any issue in that regard, just reach out to your counsel and he'll get it clarified. But his total time, was he arrested totally on federal time or has he had some state time resulting from this incident?

MR. LUSTY: So initially, he had a state detainer. I believe his bond was revoked at some point in this case.

MR. DEMATT: I know there's definitely going to be a calculation issue here because there's some state time.

THE COURT: Well, I would just ask that counsel for the government and defendant work together if there's an issue so that the Bureau of Prisons has accurate information in order to make the evaluation so that hopefully most of his time will count as federal time.

So the two of you working together can certainly help the defendant in that regard. Defendant is remanded to the custody of the United States Marshal Service for transfer to the Bureau of Prisons. Everyone should remain seated until

the marshals remove the defendant. I wish you well, sir. THE DEFENDANT: Thank you. THE COURT: Be wise. Thank you, counsel. MR. LUSTY: Thank you, Your Honor. MR. DEMATT: Thank you. THE COURT: I adjourn this hearing. CERTIFICATE I, MARSIA L. BALOBECK, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled case. \s\ Marsia L. Balobeck 10/27/2022

Date of Certification MARSIA L. BALOBECK Official Court Reporter